

approximately 15,000 pieces of ordnance dropped and six mishaps, I think it is really not a bad performance.

QUESTION (CBS News). General, you said just a few moments ago that there is no reason to change tactics, to bring in ground troops and then in the next breath you say that Milosevic, if he really wants to, can ethnically-cleanse all of Kosovo. We have had figures today of 90 percent of people thrown out of their homes, of killings, of rapes. Is that not reason enough?

GENERAL NAUMANN. You are asking a moral question, I understand you fully and from a moral point of view I also hate to see this news, but on the other hand, you can only do what is achievable and what is acceptable by our nations in this Alliance. And for that reason I have to tell you once again that we have no reason at this point in time to change the strategy which is focused to some extent on the philosophy of our democracies that we should avoid casualties, we should avoid the loss of life. That is the basic point. You may be morally dissatisfied with that but that is how life is.

QUESTION. General, you had the opportunity and the experience to meet Milosevic. You said before that we needed two to tango. Do you think that the international community can still ask Milosevic for a tango and make a political agreement with him? Secondly, according to your statement before, are the Albanians paying the price of an experiment which wants to show that the war can be won without ground troops?

GENERAL NAUMANN. No, to your last point definitely no. I think I explained to you where we stand in our societies and I think I also mentioned to you that we have to have consensus among 19 nations and that is something which you can't get on this critical issue. With regard to Milosevic and my personal experience of him, the only thing which I am really looking forward to in my imminent retirement is that this makes sure that I will never see him again!

QUESTION: General, you said that Milosevic was the best recruiting agent for the KLA but in fact it seems to me that NATO is really the best recruiting agent of the KLA since the air campaign which is taking place is partly to their benefit. You pointed out that it was impossible to eliminate the forces that merely clear villages and so on, two or three policemen could do that, but it was possible of course to degrade the Serb forces. Is in fact NATO, since there is no consensus of putting in forces in a non-permissive environment, basically hoping that the KLA will be able to do that job for them, thereby really becoming the KLA's air force?

GENERAL NAUMANN: We clearly do not want to become the KLA's air force. We have no intention of clearly siding with the KLA since we know pretty well what the political consequences may be and we still stick to the line—and I hope that President Milosevic will eventually understand it—that Kosovo should remain part of the FRY, that is part of the five points, and if he is really responsible with regard to his own people and the future of his own country, he would really grasp the opportunity.

QUESTION: General, how serious is the lack of deeds you mentioned in your statement that we need to see concerning the ESDI and the Combined Joint Task Forces. How serious is this lack in your opinion?

GENERAL NAUMANN: I have to tell you that if I read all these wonderful declarations on European Security and Defence Identity, I always admire the fantasy of those who are drafting but I am a very pragmatic, very simple-minded soldier, I would like to see something and then I compare what the Europeans can do in this present campaign and what they cannot do and for that reason for

me the very simple conclusion is that they have got to do something. And there are very simple things which you can do that do not eat up a tremendous amount of money. I am not talking of launching a European satellite programme or what have you but you have deficiencies in the European forces which have to be corrected as a matter of urgency.

Many of our air forces, for instance, do not dispose of stand-off weaponry. They have to fly more or less over the target which is the most stupid thing you can do since you expose yourself to the enemy air defence.

Another essential capability, the capabilities of the Europeans with regard to combat search and rescue are not very impressive. That is not a thing which costs tremendous billions of dollars, it is not something which would make the armaments industry open the bottles of champagne but it is extremely important for the morale of the pilots and for them nothing counts more than the assurance "We'll get you out!" And for the morale of our pilots I think nothing was more important than these two successful search-and-rescue operations and that is something we need to do.

And if I look at the deplorably slow deployment of our forces to Albania and FYROM, had we something like a European transport aircraft capability then we could do better.

Take the example of the humanitarian effort. We looked into this but most of the European transport aircraft are two-engine aircraft and they cannot climb to an altitude where you can safely travel without being exposed to missile air defences.

These are all things which can easily be done and for that you don't need another voluminous conceptual paper—we Germans are very good at liking concepts, nothing without concepts. It buys you time by the way so you have a lot of time to talk of the concepts before you have to take action!—and that is what we need to avoid. And we can take decisions, we can take them now and it would not blow up the defence budgets of the nations.

Another point which from my point of view is really the core of the issue is that if we really want to do something in Europe then we have to start to harmonise the research and development programmes of our nations. The United States of America is spending \$36 billion dollars per year for research and development, the Europeans all together—I think plus Canada—spend \$10 billion dollars per year but in contrast to them, the European programmes are not co-ordinated. So what we see expressed in these facts is an ever-growing gap between the Europeans and the Americans, and this needs to be redressed. And for something like this you don't need a European summit, you need something like the will to decide.

QUESTION. Are we positive that the VJ is digging-in in Kosovo. Jamie Shea talked this afternoon about Maginot Line kind of works. What conclusions do you draw from that and do you have the impression that still quite a lot of the refugees in Kosovo are being kept there for tactical reasons? And did you solve the problem with spies when it was talked about. That the target list was known in Belgrade at the beginning of the campaign have you any news on that?

GENERAL NAUMANN. I do not wish to comment on such speculations like the last one. That the VJ is digging-in we have seen for the last couple of weeks. They are preparing for the defence of Kosovo and they follow the good old tactics which we learned in the days of the Cold War of the Soviet tactics of defence, so it is exactly what we have in our text books that we see right now. We are not surprised by that and by the way, the more they dig in the more fixed the targets will be, the easier to hit them.

QUESTION. For the last question, General, to sum up all this discussion, what would be your vision for the development of NATO's armed forces for the future?

GENERAL NAUMANN. First of all, I think we need to find ways in which we can achieve a complementary contribution between the United States and Europe. This does not mean competition but we need to harmonise our capabilities in such a way that they really complement each other. I think that is feasible and I think it is necessary since after all we will continue to be confronted with very scarce defence dollars or euros and so we have to follow the line which our American friends are expressing with the simple sentence: "We have to get the biggest bang possible for the buck!" That is something we are not doing right now.

Secondly, we need armed forces which are ready for quick deployment, which are capable of operating under austere conditions. Whether this will be inside or outside the NATO treaty is unimportant.

We need to have forces which have a mission effectiveness and by that I mean they have to be able to project power from a distance. This means in the initial phase presumably something like unmanned vehicles like the Cruise missile, or similar capabilities, but also it goes in the direction of stand-off weaponry for our air forces and for some of our ships.

Then we need the capability to command and control such forces wherever they will be employed. We need very mobile Command, Control and Communications (C3) and we need excellent intelligence.

And if we think added as a fifth point that we have to be able to sustain these forces then I think you have the description of the future alliance forces. This means employed only on their own territory, this does not fit into NATO's future pattern and we have too think this through. By the way that is not only a problem for Germany, it is a problem for many other countries in this Alliance but if politicians are serious about using their armed forces—which I think is presumably the proper answer to the security environment—then we have to be sure that the remaining forces are so flexible and so deployable that we will be able to defend an ever-increasing NATO treaty area with ever-decreasing forces.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

#### TAX CUTS HELP AMERICAN FAMILIES

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, the Congress has just sent to the President a tax relief package. I believe very strongly that we can do three things: We can cut taxes, we can make substantial strides in paying down the debt, and we can save Social Security.

I do not think that asking for a tax cut of between 3 and 3.5 percent of the total anticipated budget spending in the next 10 years is being irresponsible. That is how this administration—the President and the Vice President, AL GORE—would like to characterize it. We have the highest tax burden since World War II. I think this Congress is being responsible to the American people in saying: You deserve some relief, too.

I am very disappointed that the President is saying he is going to veto this tax-relief package. I have believed all along that he really does not support any tax cuts. I have believed all

along that he really does not want to pay down the debt and that he really does not care that much about Social Security. I have believed all along that his real agenda is spending. As we move forward this fall with some of the debate, I think it will become more and more clear that the President's agenda is really spending, while the Republicans' agenda in the Congress—and I want to be part of that team—will be to fight to keep taxes down, will be to fight especially hard to pay down the debt, and to save Social Security.

I would like to take a moment to make some comments on tax cuts. I believe we took an important step toward addressing our Nation's future by passing the \$792 billion tax cut package last month. We passed a bill that pays down the debt, ensures that our obligations to Social Security are met, and provides tax relief for millions of Americans.

This tax cut package returns the tax overpayment to those who paid it. I believe this is a far better option than the plans we have seen from the other side of the aisle that would merely spend the extra money. Under our plan, a middle-class family of four will receive over \$1,000 a year in tax relief when the plan is fully implemented.

In addition to broad-based relief for all taxpayers, the tax bill provides relief in many important areas, including the marriage penalty, the alternative minimum tax, savings and investment, education, health care, the estate tax, and housing.

I, for one, believe in the "opportunity society." I believe in success and that people should not be punished when they succeed and prosper. The surplus belongs to those who are succeeding and paying record levels of taxes. When we cut taxes, people are motivated to work harder, and the economy does well. When the economy does well, everyone does well.

Some are trying to claim that the Republicans want to return money to the people instead of paying down the debt. Nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, in 2000, the Republican plan, along with a significant tax cut, leaves the public debt \$220 billion less than the President's budget proposal. The Republican plan saves 75 percent of the total surplus, as compared to the President's plan which only saves 67 percent of the surplus.

I also point out that the Republican plan saves every penny of the Social Security surplus. The President's budget spends \$29 billion of the Social Security surplus.

These numbers come from the Congressional Budget Office, which Members of Congress can rely on, on a non-partisan basis, to provide us with accurate figures.

Clearly, the recent debate in the Senate was not about debt repayment. The debate was about what to do with the surplus money after addressing debt repayment. I happen to believe we should refund this overpayment to the tax-

payors. Some of my colleagues believe we should spend it. I believe the American people are in a better position to know what they need than the Government, particularly the Government here in Washington. I believe we should let the people keep more of their own money to spend on their priorities, not Washington's priorities. I believe the tax package we passed will do just that.

By contrast, the President's budget increases taxes—I repeat that, increases taxes—by nearly \$100 billion over 10 years. I find it interesting that the President claims we cannot afford \$792 billion in tax cuts but believes we can afford \$1 trillion in new spending.

Although some have tried to portray the tax-relief package as large and irresponsible, I have to disagree. The tax cuts only equal 3.5 percent of what the Congressional Budget Office projects the Federal Government will take in over the next 10 years. In light of the fact Federal tax receipts are already at a record high, I consider this tax cut to be extremely modest.

In response to the claim that tax cuts only help the rich, first of all, tax cuts are for taxpayers. If you do not pay taxes, you can't get a tax cut. Under the recently passed tax bill, every American who pays income taxes will get an income tax cut.

Our income tax system is progressive. The top 1 percent of earners make 16 percent of the income but pay 32 percent of the income taxes. The top 25 percent of earners pay 81 percent of the income tax, and the top half of earners pay nearly all of the income taxes.

Looking more closely at who pays the income taxes, as I noted, the top half of earners pay nearly all of the Federal income taxes. As taxpayers, they will be the ones to receive a tax cut.

I would like to examine who those so-called rich are. The rich are 62 percent of all homeowners; 66 percent of those between the ages of 45 and 64; 67 percent of those with a child in the home; 68 percent of those who have attended college, even just one quarter of college; 69 percent of married couples; and 80 percent of two-earner households.

I want to comment about the 80 percent of two-earner households. I believe most of those are young Americans who are trying to get started. They are young families, people who have just graduated from college, maybe just come from high school and have the first job. They are trying to buy a house, get a family started, and pay for a very expensive education. In order to do that, both the husband and the wife work. We are taking 80 percent of those two-earner households and we are taxing them at record levels. This particular tax bill is going to help young families getting started, future citizens of this country, the future leaders of this country.

I think this is a very good piece of legislation. I remind Senators, again, to remember when they hear our Dem-

ocrat colleagues talk about the rich who benefit from those tax cuts, this is really who they are talking about.

I am pleased this body has taken steps to address tax relief for hard-working Americans. I will continue to support efforts to cut taxes and downsize Government. I believe Congress should reject new taxes and new spending in favor of meaningful tax relief. It is time we return Government money to the rightful owner—the American people.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANTORUM). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will state the conference report to accompany H.R. 2587.

The legislative assistant read as follows:

The committee on conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2587), have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses this report, signed by a majority of the conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of September 9, 1999.)

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, today I am pleased to bring to the Senate floor the conference report making appropriations for the Government of the District of Columbia for fiscal year 2000. The conference report endorses the District's \$5.3 billion operating budget and its \$1.4 billion capital budget, as adopted by the mayor, the District council, and the financial authority.

The conference report appropriates \$429.1 million in Federal funds. In fact, having worked out this legislation with the House, the conference report is actually \$18.3 million more than the President's request. This is a good bill for the residents of the District of Columbia and for the people of America, whose capital this is.

Let me list some of the positive provisions.

For education, we have provided \$17 million in funding for a new and unique tuition program that will allow D.C. students to pay instate tuition rates at universities. The District is home to only one public university. This legislation will allow D.C. students the opportunity to attend universities outside the District of Columbia without